

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11-24 and 27-28 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 14-16, 23, and 27-28 are amended, and claims 10 and 25 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the claims can be found through the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 17-22 are allowed. The Examiner is further thanked for the indication that claims 25 and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; that claims 1 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and that claims 2-3, 6, 10, 14-16, and 27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as discussed below. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 5 should be in condition for allowance, along with claims 2-3 and 6, which depend respectively therefrom.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to include the features of objected to claim 10. Accordingly, independent claim 7 should be in condition for allowance, along with claims 8-9 and 11-13, which depend therefrom. Further, dependent claims 14 and 16 have been rewritten

in independent form. Accordingly, claims 14 and 16 should be in condition for allowance, along with claim 15, which depends from claim 14.

Additionally, the allowable features of objected to claim 25 have been added to independent claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 should be in condition for allowance, along with claim 24, which depends therefrom. Further, dependent claims 27 and 28 have been rewritten in independent form, and thus should also be in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. Each of the Examiner's comments has been addressed in amending independent claims 1 and 5. The Examiner commented, regarding independent claim 1, that "the position sensing means and driver control means for the mover appear to have nothing to do with 'an apparatus for controlling cooling of a gantry' as recited in the preamble to the claim." The Examiner also commented, regarding independent claim 5, that "the last five lines of the claims are concerned with correcting a movement command to the mover" and that this "method step has nothing to do with controlling the cooling of a gantry." The Examiner is respectfully directed to page 15-16 of the specification, lines 13-14 and 1-6, respectively, for example, which discuss reducing the velocity of the linear motors to prevent overheating. Reducing the velocity of the linear motors reduces the heat output by the linear motors, in addition to allowing sinking of the additional heat in the provided heat sinks. Accordingly, these claims should be in condition for allowance, along with the claims that depend therefrom.

The Office Action rejected claim 27 as depending from canceled claim 26. Claim 27 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 4, 7, 9, 11-13, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard et al. (hereinafter "Menard"), U.S. Patent No. 5,828,501, in view of Japanese Patent No. JP354106969, Emoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,226,073, and Crevel, U.S. Patent No. 4,494,184. This rejection is moot with respect to claims 7, 9, 11-13, and 23-24 due to the amendments discussed above. The rejection is respectfully traversed insofar as it applies to amended claim 4.

Independent claim 4 has been amended to recite the step of controlling movements of the at least one linear motor based on the comparison of the measured temperatures with the pre-set temperature value. The applied prior art, taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest at least these features. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 4 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carol L. Druzick**, at the telephone number listed below.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/777,689  
Reply to Office Action dated October 17, 2003

Docket No. MRE-0008

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart  
Registration No. 38,128  
Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 CLD/kah

**Date: June 23, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**